

# Exhibit 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2021 11:16 AM

**Technical Review Coversheet**

Applicant: Samar Ahmad (P022A210053-002)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Quality of Proposed Project</b>		
<b>Quality of Proposed Project</b>		
1. Proposed Project	60	56
<b>Qualifications of the Applicant</b>		
<b>Qualifications of the Applicant</b>		
1. Applicant	40	23
<b>General Comments</b>		
<b>General Comments</b>		
1. General Comments	0	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Priority Languages</b>		
1. Preference Priority	2	2
<b>Academic Fields</b>		
1. Preference Priority	3	3
<b>Total</b>	105	84

## Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Near East - 1: 84.022A

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Samar Ahmad (P022A210053-002)

### Questions

#### Quality of Proposed Project - Quality of Proposed Project

1. Quality of Proposed Project - The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the research project proposed by the applicant. The Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 56

#### Sub

1. The statement of the major hypotheses to be tested or questions to be examined and the description and justification of the research methods to be used.

#### Strengths:

This is a well-developed proposal with a clear set of research questions and a succinct description of the research background. The proposed methodology (oral history through interviews and archival research) seems justified given the objective of the research.

#### Weaknesses:

No weakness observed.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The relationship of the research to the literature on the topic and to major theoretical issues in the field, and the project's originality and importance in terms of the concerns of the discipline.

#### Strengths:

Although there is scant literature on the topic, the applicant has done a good job in drawing from existing literature and juxtaposing the research questions against what is known about the topic from scattered sources. The proposal contains an original idea and fits well within the academic discipline of the applicant.

#### Weaknesses:

The literature review seems a little disjointed. The narrative lacks the synthesis of knowledge drawn from related fields. The applicant makes reference to Lebanon, Algeria etc., but does not integrate the inferences drawn from those struggles in her narrative.

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

3. The preliminary research already completed in the United States and overseas or plans for such research prior to going overseas, and the kinds, quality and availability of data for the research in the host country or countries.

**Strengths:**

The narrative indicates that the applicant has already conducted necessary preliminary work and have identified the data and sources thereof needed for the field research in Jordan.

**Weaknesses:**

More details should have been provided about prior research that the applicant has already conducted.

**Reader's Score:** 9

4. The justification for overseas field research, and preparations to establish appropriate and sufficient research contacts and affiliations abroad.

**Strengths:**

Since the proposed field work would rely on interviews (oral history) together with archival research of documents from personal and family collections, this research cannot be completed without the field work. The applicant seems to have established necessary contacts in the host country (Jordan) and has already done some work there in the past. Such contacts should help the applicant with her field work.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

5. The applicant's plans to share the results of the research in progress and a copy of the dissertation with scholars and officials of the host country or countries.

**Strengths:**

The applicant has explained how she intends to share her research findings with scholars and students in the host country.

**Weaknesses:**

The project narrative does not make any reference to depositing a copy of the dissertation with the host institution in Jordan.

**Reader's Score:** 4

6. The guidance and supervision of the dissertation advisor or committee at all stages of the project, including guidance in developing the project, understanding research conditions abroad, and acquainting the applicant with research in the field.

**Strengths:**

The members of the dissertation committee possess necessary expertise in the field. It is clear from the recommendation letters that the committee members are committed to providing necessary guidance to the applicant during all the stages of the applicant's dissertation work. The narrative demonstrates that the applicant is already well-versed with the relevant fields of research and the research conditions that she would encounter in the

**Sub**

course of her field research.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness observed.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Qualifications of the Applicant - Qualifications of the Applicant**

1. **Qualifications of the Applicant - The Secretary reviews each application to determine the qualifications of the applicant. The Secretary considers:**

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Sub**

1. **The overall strength of the applicant's graduate academic record.**

**Strengths:**

The recommendation letters indicate the applicant's good academic performance and research ability. The applicant's Master's Transcript from the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, bears testimony to her stellar academic performance.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide her graduate transcripts (Master's and Ph.D.) from Georgetown University. Those transcripts would have made this application stronger and would have allowed this reviewer to make more informed comment about the strength of the applicant with respect to her graduate academic work at Georgetown University.

**Reader's Score: 8**

2. **The extent to which the applicant's academic record demonstrates a strength in area studies relevant to the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has taken sufficient number of area studies courses in the UK that should prepare her well for the proposed field work.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness observed.

**Reader's Score: 10**

3. **The applicant's proficiency in one or more of the languages (other than English and the applicant's native language) of the country or countries of research, and the specific measures to be taken to overcome any anticipated language barriers.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

None noted.

**Weaknesses:**

Since Arabic is the native language of the applicant, the question of language proficiency is not applicable.

**Reader's Score:** 0

4. **The applicant's ability to conduct research in a foreign cultural context, as evidenced by the applicant's references or previous overseas experiences, or both.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's experience in London, UK as a Master's student and prior work in Jordan should have prepared her well to undertake the proposed research. The applicant's native fluency in Arabic will be another plus for her. It is clear from various supporting documents provided as part of the application package that the applicant is qualified and fully prepared to independently conduct research in a foreign cultural context (Jordan in this case).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**General Comments - General Comments**

1. **Please provide general comments.**

**General:**

This is a well developed proposal. The applicant's native fluency in Arabic should greatly facilitate conducting the field research.

Certain information that the researcher is seeking may be considered sensitive given the socio-political reality of the host country. The narrative should have explained how the researcher would handle such sensitivities should her subjects show reluctance to candidly share their opinion and experience. The proposal would have been stronger had the application package contained the transcript from Georgetown University.

**Reader's Score:** 0

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Priority Languages**

1. **We award an additional two (2) points to an application if it meets this priority:**

**A research project that focuses on any modern foreign language except French, German, or Spanish.**

**Note: The score will be EITHER TWO (2) OR ZERO (0). Do not enter any other number.**

**General:**

The application meets this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score:** 2

**Competitive Preference Priority - Academic Fields**

1. We award an additional three (3) points to an application if it meets this priority:

A research project conducted in the field of science, technology, engineering, mathematics, computer science, education (comparative or international), international development, political science, public health, or economics.

**Note:** Applicants that address Competitive Preference Priority 2 must intend to engage in full-time dissertation research abroad in modern foreign languages and area studies with a thematic focus on any one of the academic fields referenced above.

**Note:** The score will be EITHER THREE (3) OR ZERO (0). Do not enter any other number.

**General:**

The proposal meets this priority.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/07/2021 11:16 AM